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VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

JOURNAL ARTICLE CRITIQUES

A REPORT SUBMITTED TO
DR. DEWEY A. ADAMS
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
EDVT 6073
EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY
IN VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
SUMMER 1974
BY
DAVID I. JOYNER
JULY 18, 1974

The author challenges Vocational educators to accept the concept of accountability and prove to other educators that they know what it means and how to apply it to a teaching-learning situation. His point that most vocational educators, through their experiences in business and industry, know first hand the consequences of not producing a good day's work for a good day's pay is indeed well taken. This idea is analogous to accountability in education.


I like the idea expressed by the author that vocational educators must support an open theory of education which allows them to accept the responsibility for their students being capable of intelligent behavior as well as technical skills. She says that accountability may limit teaching and learning to those things which can be measured quantitatively and that profes-
ionals in education should show their true feelings in this regard rather than simply comply with the demands of the public. It seems to me that this is a narrow concept of accountability because it can account for quantitative and qualitative learning and include all types of responsibilities.


The author, quite correctly, begins by making an analogy between a company which produces automobiles and an educational system which produces students as products with the idea that both systems are accountable to consumers in similar ways. He claims that cost effectiveness, as employed by economists, is a rational approach to accountability in education. Fears that research will not support these methods might vanish once school systems develop a data collection system consistent with economic concepts of costs.

The idea is forwarded that accountability is aimed at everyone concerned with the educational system. Teachers are simply the earliest targets. The author says that the student is the person to whom all these people are accountable because he is the target of the educational process. I think this is true but the student should also be accountable for using wisely the investment made for him.